

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JAMEL DAVIS, #660276,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 2:12-CV-10382
HONORABLE LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF

SHERRY BURT,

Respondent.

/

**OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS AND DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The Court has before it Jamal Davis's *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner is a state prisoner currently confined at the Cooper Street Correctional Facility in Jackson, Michigan. Petitioner did not pay the required filing fee when he filed his habeas petition, nor did he submit an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a); 28 U.S.C. § 1915; Rule 3 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. The Court, therefore, issued an Order to Correct Deficiency on February 9, 2012 requiring Petitioner to either pay the filing fee or submit a properly completed *in forma pauperis* application. The order provided that if Petitioner did not do so within 21 days, his case would be dismissed.

The time for submitting the filing fee or required information has elapsed and Petitioner has failed to correct the deficiency. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner may submit a new habeas petition with payment of the filing fee or an *in forma pauperis* application. The Court makes no determination as to the merits of the petition. This case is **CLOSED**.

Before Petitioner may appeal the Court's decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(a); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). A certificate of appealability may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When a federal court denies relief on procedural grounds without addressing the merits of a habeas petition, a certificate of appealability should issue if it is shown that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petitioner states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). Reasonable jurists could not debate the correctness of the Court's procedural ruling. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Lawrence P. Zatkoff
LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 20, 2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this Order was served upon the attorneys of record by electronic or U.S. mail on March 20, 2012.

S/Marie E. Verlinde
Case Manager
(810) 984-3290